

APPLICANT(S): BURR, Jeremy
SERIAL NO.: 10/035,463
FILED: October 18, 2001
Page 8

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant asserts that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-28 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-28 have been rejected (the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-28, but Applicant notes that claim 3 was cancelled in a previous paper). Claims 1, 7 and 18 have been amended.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ahmed et al. (US 6,816,460) in view of Kagan et al. (US 5,618,045). While the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-28, Applicant notes that claim 3 was cancelled in a previous paper.

Applicant respectfully asserts amended independent claims 1, 7 and 18, and their dependent claims are patentable in light of Ahmed et al. and Kagan et al, alone or in combination.

More specifically, Applicant asserts that neither Ahmed et al. nor Kagan et al. alone or in combination teach or disclose that "... a route of the routing table is ... determined according to a cheapest cost of communication channels between mobile devices of said subset of said ad-hoc network which said cost of communication channels includes a direct or indirect route to an intended device of said subset of the ad-hoc network ..." as recited in amended independent claims 1, 7 and 18.

APPLICANT(S): BURR, Jeremy
SERIAL NO.: 10/035,463
FILED: October 18, 2001
Page 9

Applicant respectfully submits that the distinguishing features of claims 1, 7 and 18 would not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in view of Ahmed et al. and Kagan et al. alone or in combination with any other prior art references on record. Therefore, amended independent claims 1, 7 and 18 are patentable over the prior art references of record.

Furthermore, Ahmed et al. teaches a method of establishing an ad-hoc mobile network between all in-range and out of range mobile stations which wish to join the ad-hoc network and a routing table having routes based on the location indicator of each mobile station. Applicant respectfully asserts that the intention of Ahmed et al.'s teaching is to solve the problem of routing protocols which require a node maintaining accurate information of out of range mobile stations (column 2 lines 11-24) which was solved by using geometry-based routing protocols. More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Ahmed et al. and Kagan et al. alone or in combination do not disclose the use of a cheapest cost of communication channel to determine the route path between two mobile devices within the same sub-network. At column 4 lines 35-45 Ahmed et al. discloses "In other words, nodes are preferably connected as point to point wireless links that gives rise to a k-neighborhood for a node ..."

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented at least because the proposed combination does not teach or disclose establishing a subset of the ad-hoc network which may include a direct or indirect route to in range devices of the subset network.

Each of claims 2, 4-5, 8-17 and 19-28 depends from one of patentable base claims 1, 7 and 18. In addition to any independent bases for patentability, Applicant respectfully submit that claims 2, 4-5, 8-17 and 19-28 are patentable over the cited reference(s) by virtue of at least such dependency on patentable base claims 1, 7 and 18. Applicant asserts that claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-28 are new, not obvious and patentable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-28 be withdrawn.

APPLICANT(S): BURR, Jeremy
SERIAL NO.: 10/035,463
FILED: October 18, 2001
Page 10

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant asserts that the pending claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

/Caleb Pollack/
Caleb Pollack, Reg. No. 37,912
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,912

Dated: June 28, 2009

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801